UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,685	07/31/2003	Tidhar Ziv	11884/403401	7660

23838 7590 06/26/2007

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K STREET N.W.
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
LE, MIRANDA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	**Application No.** 10/630,685	**Applicant(s)** ZIV, TIDHAR	
	Examiner Miranda Le	**Art Unit** 2167	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 June 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
   a) ☒ The period for reply expires *3* months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
   Claim(s) allowed: *None*.
   Claim(s) objected to: *None*.
   Claim(s) rejected: *1-20,35-53 and 56-68*.
   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: *None*.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Miranda Le
June 22, 2007

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments do not overcome the final rejections.
Applicant argues:
1. Hulse does not teach or suggest setting at least one property of the instantiated company object on the client system with data from the client system,
2. Hulse does not teach the object conforms to a COM standard.
3. No reason to combine Hall and Hulse.
4. Claims 61, 63, 65, and 67 – all business objects used by the external program/client system/computer system to access the business database exist as predefined component object model objects on the client/computer system –
5. Claims 48, 49, 52, 53, 58, and 59 – The combination of Hall, Hulse, and Srinivasan.

In response:
1. Hulse does teach setting at least one property of the instantiated company object on the client system with data from the client system.
Instantiated Company object equates to new object (i.e. the association of the GUI display element is also retrieved by the new object, [0027], Hulse).
It should be noted that new object is the instantiated of new class ([0027]).
Instantiated Company object further equates to what objects in [0033] (i.e. The DCA platform 2 subsequently determines what objects in the application appropriate rendering to apply the action (step 62). The action is applied to the objects (step 64) and the results are displayed for the user when the application appropriate rendering is displayed for the requesting user (step 66), [0033], Husle)
Instantiated Company object also equates to instance of that object type (i.e. The table definition displays the name and description attributes for every defined instance of that object type in the system, [0023])
Setting at least one property equates to a child class object may inherit the attributes and properties of the parent class, [0027], Hulse.
Setting at least one property also equates to "Revise" the object as stated in [0040] of Hulse (The object details page contains details of an automobile fender part. The page includes an action pulldown box with different actions "Delete" 102, "Check Out" 104, and "Revise" 106, See [0040], Hulse).
The GUI for displaying belongs to a client system; therefore the instantiated object associated with a new object should be on the client system.
The data from the client system equates to the data value representing the employee number is plugged into a table cell being displayed in the rendering for the requesting user, [0027], Hulse.
Therefore, contrary to applicant's argument, Hulse does disclose setting at least one property of the instantiated company object on the client system with data from the client system, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See Ex parte Obiaya, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).
Applicant has made a piecemeal analysis of the references. Applicant is therefore reminded that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

2. Hulse does teach the object conforms to a COM standard.
Hall states that any component object model compatible programming language can make use of the components of the DMS, See [0060].
Hulse teaches the configuration repository is the Object Specifications sub-component, See [0020].
Therefore, the Object Specifications sub-component of Hulse would be able to make use of the components of the DMS of Hall's system.

3. Applicant seems to be questioning whether the Hall and Hulse references are combinable to reasonably establish the prima facie case of obviousness under 35 USC 103.
In response to the preceding arguments, the examiner submits that in order for references to be combinable to reasonably establish the prima facie case of obviousness under 35 USC 103, they must be analogous and within the same field of endeavor.
In this case, Hall is directed to a system and method providing data interface (i.e. The object server component manages data storage and retrieval functions in the data sources for the client application, based on the metadata) for external access to the database (i.e. data source, [0010]) by the third-party software product (i.e. The object definition component reads the metadata from the object definition database and provides it to the object server component, [0010]).
Hulse is directed to a system and method providing data interface (i.e. creates a dynamic client architecture which can be used as the framework for applications written in multiple programming languages, [0001]; allow the DCA platform 2 to communicate to one or more servers in order to manipulate the data provided by the end user, [0022]) for external access to the database by third-party software product (i.e. The configuration depository, [0016-0017]).
The two references are directed to the same field as a system and method for providing data interface for external access to the database by third-party software products.
Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills of the art having the teachings or Hall and Hulse at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hall to include the limitations as taught by Hulse.
One of ordinary skills in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to retrieve a data value for an instantiated member of the child class, and the data value representing the employee number is plugged into a table cell being displayed in the rendering for the requesting user ([0027]) in view of Hulse, as doing so it would give the added benefit of creating a dynamic client

architecture which can be used as the framework for applications written in multiple programming languages ([005]) as taught by Hulse.

4. Claims 61, 63, 65, and 67 – Hall does teach all business objects used by the external program/client system/computer system to access the business database exist as predefined component object model objects on the client/computer system.

As per claim 61, 63, 65, 67, Hall teaches the method of claim 5, wherein the company object is a highest object in the hierarchy of objects used to access the business database, all business objects used by the external program to access the business database exist as predefined component object model objects on the client system, and instances of the business objects are created on the client system via the company object (i.e. The first tier 18a in the data environment 12 includes a user 32 of the client application 16, the ObjMgr component 28, based controls 34, and a word processor 36. The first tier 18a also includes a developer 38, who works with the ObjMgr component 28. The middle or second tier 18b includes the ObjDef component 20, ObjSvr component 22, and RptGen component 30. The third tier 18c includes the data sources 14 and ObjDef database 24. The first tier 18a thus includes clients, the second tier 18b includes elements which can be either clients or servers, and the third tier 18c includes servers, [0033], Hall).

As discussed, Hall teaches the ObjDef component 20, 20a, 20b is stored in either client or Server – The middle or second tier 18a includes elements which can be either client or server - as shown in Fig. 1 (i.e. The first tier 18a in the data environment 12 includes a user 32 of the client application 16, the ObjMgr component 28, based controls 34, and a word processor 36. The first tier 18a also includes a developer 38, who works with the ObjMgr component 28. The middle or second tier 18b includes the ObjDef component 20, ObjSvr component 22, and RptGen component 30. The third tier 18c includes the data sources 14 and ObjDef database 24. The first tier 18a thus includes clients, the second tier 18b includes elements which can be either clients or servers, and the third tier 18c includes servers, [0033], Hall).

5. Claims 48, 49, 52, 53, 58, and 59 – The combination of Hall, Hulse, and Srinivasan.

As per claim 48, 52, 58, Hall does not teach the method of claim 1 wherein said company object is instantiated in a data interface application programming interface implemented on the client system as a dynamic link library.

However, Srinivasan teaches company object is instantiated in a data interface application programming interface implemented on the client system as a dynamic link library (i.e. The functions generated may take numerous forms, for instance, application user-defined functions, application macros or dynamic link libraries (DLLs). The network components may also be of a number of types, for instance, Java components, Component Object Model (COM) components or other network services components supported over protocols such as the Hyper-Text Transfer Protocol (HTTP), [0020]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Hall, Hulse, and Srinivasan at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hall, and Hulse, to include company object is instantiated in a data interface application programming interface implemented on the client system as a dynamic link library as taught by Srinivasan.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to generate a function for an application to access data from a network component. The function may include a network component interface to identify the types of the data and an application interface to supply the data in compatible types for the application ([0020]) in view of Srinivasan, as doing so would give the added benefit of opportunities for sharing of data among businesses and individuals in computer networking environment as taught by Srinivasan ([0002]).

As per claim 49, 53, 59, Hall teaches the method of claim 48 further comprising accessing said business database using business objects from said company object, wherein said business objects expose a plurality of methods for accessing said business database (i.e. The first tier 18a in the data environment 12 includes a user 32 of the client application 16, the ObjMgr component 28, based controls 34, and a word processor 36. The first tier 18a also includes a developer 38, who works with the ObjMgr component 28. The middle or second tier 18b includes the ObjDef component 20, ObjSvr component 22, and RptGen component 30. The third tier 18c includes the data sources 14 and ObjDef database 24. The first tier 18a thus includes clients, the second tier 18b includes elements which can be either clients or servers, and the third tier 18c includes servers, [0033], Hall).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, Hall is directed to a system and method providing data interface (i.e. The object server component manages data storage and retrieval functions in the data sources for the client application, based on the metadata) for external access to the database (i.e. data source, [0010]) by the third-party software product (i.e. The object definition component reads the metadata from the object definition database and provides it to the object server component, [0010]).

Hulse is directed to a system and method providing data interface (i.e. creates a dynamic client architecture which can be used as the framework for applications written in multiple programming languages, [0001]; allow the DCA platform 2 to communicate to one or more servers in order to manipulate the data provided by the end user, [0022]) for external access to the database by third-party software product (i.e. The configuration depository, [0016-0017]).

Srinivasan is directed to the same field as a system and method providing data interface (i.e. Automated network data gathering utility 101 comprises interface 116 to application 117 and interface 114 to a network component via network 113, [0026]) for external access to the database by third-party software products (i.e. to access data from one or more network components through interface 114 and to provide the data to interface 116 for application 117, [0026]).

Since the three references are directed to a system and method providing data interface for external access to the database by the third-party software product, consequently, Hall, Hulse and Srinivasan, as combined, teach the step of company object is instantiated in a data interface application programming interface implemented on the client system as a dynamic link library as Srinivasan teaches this limitation ([0026]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Hall, Hulse, and Srinivasan at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hall, and Hulse, to include company object is instantiated in a data interface application programming interface implemented on the client system as a dynamic link library as taught by Srinivasan.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to generate a function for an application to access data from a network component. The function may include a network component interface to identify the types of the data and an application interface to supply the data in compatible types for the application ([0020]) in view of Srinivasan, as doing so would give the added benefit of opportunities for sharing of data among businesses and individuals in computer networking environment as taught by Srinivasan ([0002]).

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.